arXiv:math/0703467v1 [math.NT] 15 Mar 2007

On sequences of positive integers containing no p terms in arithmetic progression

Goutam Pal*

11 Nov 2006

Dept. of Mathematics,
RCC-Institute of Information Technology,
South Canal Road, Beliaghata,
Kolkata-700015

Abstract

We use topological ideas to show that, assuming the conjecture of Erdös [4] on subsets of positive integers having no p terms in arithmetic progression (A. P.), there must exist a subset M_p of positive integers with no p terms in A. P. with the property that among all such subsets, M_p maximizes the sum of the reciprocals of its elements.

1 Introduction

A famous conjecture of Erdös asserts that if A is a subset of the positive integers having the property that $\sum_{a\in A}\frac{1}{a}=\infty$, then A must contain arithmetic progressions of arbitrary length. A special case of the conjecture, when A is the set of prime numbers, was recently proved by Green and Tao [3]. This implies that

*E-mail: gkmstr@gmail.com

if a subset A of the set of positive integers contains no arithmetic progression of length p, where $p \geq 3$ is a fixed integer, then the sum $\sum_{a \in A} \frac{1}{a}$ must converge. In this paper we assume the Erdös conjecture and deduce a much stronger consequence of it. We ask whether the sum above can be arbitrarily large as the sets A vary. Our first theorem answers the question in the negative.

Joseph L. Gerver [1] proved that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists for all but a finite number of integers $p \geq 3$, sets S_p of positive integers, containing no arithmetic progression of p terms, such that $\sum_{a \in S_p} \frac{1}{a} > (1 - \epsilon)p \log p$. The set S_p is the sequence $\{a_n\}$ where $a_1 = 1$ and for $n \geq 1$, a_{n+1} is the smallest positive integer bigger than a_n such that no p elements of $a_1, a_2, \cdots a_{n+1}$in arithmetic progression.He guessed in that paper that for any prime p, the set S_p may indeed maximize the sum of the reciprocals of the elements of a set of positive integers having no p terms in arithmetic progression. On the other hand Joseph L. Gerver and L.Thomas Ramsey [2] showed heuristically that the set S_p is not maximizing the above sum for composite p. A corollary to our second theorem says that the Erdös conjecture implies the existence of a set of positive integers containing no p terms in arithmetic progression which maximizes the above sum.

In rest of the paper, p is any fixed integer greater than or equal to 3.

The author thanks Professor Bhaskar Bagchi for valuable suggestions.

2 Main Results

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathscr{A}_p$ be the collection of all subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ having no arithmetic progression of length p. Then, under the assumption of the Erdös conjecture,*

there is an absolute constant B_p such that

$$\text{Sup}\left\{\sum_{a\in A}\frac{1}{a} : A \in \mathscr{A}_p\right\} \leq B_p. \tag{1}$$

For further discussion, we need a topological structure on $\mathscr{A}_p$. First we note that there is a natural one-to-one correspondence between the power set $\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{N})$ and the set $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ of all sequences of 0s and 1s ; namely, given any subset $A \subset \mathbb{N}$, we send it to the sequence $\{\delta_A(n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, where

$$\delta_A(n) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } n \in A \\ 0 \text{ otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

Since $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is compact by Tychonoff's theorem, the above identification makes $\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{N})$ into a compact topological space. In this topology, a sequence $\{A_n\}$ of subsets converges to A if, for any given k, there is some N_k such that, whenever $n \geq N_k$,

$$\delta_{A_n}(j) = \delta_A(j) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \cdots, k. \tag{2}$$

Proposition 4 below says that $\mathscr{A}_p$ is a compact subspace of $\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{N})$. For any set $A \in \mathscr{A}_p$, let us denote the sum $\sum_{a\in A}\frac{1}{a}$ (which converges if we assume Erdös conjecture) by $\mu(A)$. Then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *The map $A \longmapsto \mu(A)$ between $\mathscr{A}_p$ and $[0, B_p]$ is continuous.*

Since $\mathscr{A}_p$ is compact, theorem 2 implies the following corollary.

Corollary 3. *Under the assumption of the Erdös conjecture, there is a set $M_p \in \mathscr{A}_p$ such that*

$$\mu(X) \leq \mu(M_p) \text{ for all } X \in \mathscr{A}_p. \tag{3}$$

That is, the supremum of the set $\{\mu(X) : X \in \mathscr{A}_p\}$ is attained.

3 Proofs

In this section, we shall present the proofs of theorem 1 and theorem 2. First we prove a proposition that will be needed later.

Proposition 4. *$\mathscr{A}_p$ is a compact subspace of $\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{N})$.*

Proof. Since $\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{N})$ is compact, it is enough to show that $\mathscr{A}_p$ is closed. Let $\{A_n\}$ be sequence in $\mathscr{A}_p$ converging to some $A \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{N})$. We need to show that $A \in \mathscr{A}_p$. Let us denote

$A_n = \{a_1^{(n)}, a_2^{(n)}, \cdots\}$ and $A = \{a_1, a_2, \cdots\}$, where the terms in the sequences are written in the increasing order. Suppose, if possible, that $A \notin \mathscr{A}_p$. So there is an arithmetic progression $\{a_{k_1}, a_{k_2}, \cdots, a_{k_p}\} \subset A$. We shall obtain a contradiction from this. Since $A_n \longmapsto A$, by the criterion (2) for convergence, we must have, for any given k, some integer N_k such that,

$$a_j^{(n)} = a_j \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \cdots, k \tag{4}$$

for all $n \geq N_k$. In particular, if $k = k_p$, we have, for $n \geq N_{k_p}$,

$$a_{k_i}^{(n)} = a_{k_i} \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, p. \tag{5}$$

Since $\{a_{k_i} : i = 1, 2, \cdots, p\}$ is an arithmetic progression, the above implies that $A_n \notin \mathscr{A}_p$ for $n \geq N_{k_p}$, which is a contradiction. So $A \in \mathscr{A}_p$ as was required to be proved.

□

Proof of theorem 1

Proof. We shall prove this by contradiction. Let $A_0 = A \in \mathscr{A}_p$ be any finite set with $\sum_{a \in A} \frac{1}{a} = L > 0$. For example, we can take $A_0 = \{1\}$. If we assume that the statement of the theorem is not true, then we shall show that there is a finite set $B \supset A$, $B \in \mathscr{A}_p$ with

$$\sum_{b \in B} \frac{1}{b} \geq L + 1. \tag{6}$$

This will result in a contradiction to the conjecture of Erdös in the following manner. Repeating this process that produces B recursively, we get an increasing sequence of sets $A_0 \subset A_1 \subset A_2 \subset \cdots$, each of them finite and they all are in $\mathscr{A}_p$. Moreover,

$$\sum_{a \in A_j} \frac{1}{a} \geq L + j.$$

Now the set $A_\infty = A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \cdots$ must be in $\mathscr{A}_p$ since any given collection of p elements in A_∞ must also belong to A_n for some n, so those elements can not be in arithmetic progression. On the other hand, the sum $\sum_{a \in A} \frac{1}{a}$ must diverge as it is bigger than any fixed number. So all that is now left to prove the theorem is to produce such a set B, given A.

Let N be the maximum of the elements of A. If the theorem is untrue, then there must exist a set $E \in \mathscr{A}_p$ such that

$$\sum_{e \in E} \frac{1}{e} \geq 2N. \tag{7}$$

In fact, we may take E to be a finite set; since, if E is infinite, the tail of the convergent sum will be small. Now define

$$B = A \sqcup 2NE, \tag{8}$$

where $\sqcup$ denotes disjoint union, and $2NE = \{2Ne : e \in E\}$. Clearly B is a finite set containing A, and

$$\sum_{b \in B} \frac{1}{b} = \sum_{a \in A} \frac{1}{a} + \sum_{e \in E} \frac{1}{2Ne} \geq L + 1 \tag{9}$$

by (7 , 8). Now to show that $B \in \mathscr{A}_p$, we first note that since $A \in \mathscr{A}_p$ and $E \in \mathscr{A}_p$, no p elements of either A or $2NE$ can be in arithmetic progression. Suppose, if possible, that $b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_p \in B$ are in A.P., where $b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_k \in A$, and $b_{k+1}, b_{k+2}, \cdots, b_p \in 2NE$. If $k \geq 2$, then

$$b_{k+1} - b_k = b_k - b_{k-1}. \tag{10}$$

Now, $b_k - b_{k-1} \leq N - 1$ since $b_k, b_{k-1} \in A$ and N is the maximum of the elements of A. But the right hand side, $b_{k+1} - b_k \geq b_{k+1} - N \geq 2N - N = N$, a contradiction. If $k = 1$, then

$$b_2 - b_1 = b_3 - b_2, \tag{11}$$

or equivalently,

$$b_1 = 2b_2 - b_3. \tag{12}$$

But $b_1 \leq N$, while $2b_2 - b_3$ is a multiple of $2N$ as both $b_2, b_3 \in 2NE$. So we arrive at a contradiction again. Hence we conclude that B cannot have an arithmetic progression of length p.

□

For proving theorem 2, we first prove a lemma.

Lemma 5. *Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist a natural number N such that for any $A \in \mathscr{A}_p$ with* Min $A \geq N$,

$$\sum_{a \in A} \frac{1}{a} < \varepsilon. \tag{13}$$

Note: In the above, Min A denotes the smallest element in A.

Proof. Suppose, if possible, the lemma is not correct. Then there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any given integer $M \geq 1$, there is a set $R \in \mathscr{A}_p$ depending on M with the following properties:

$$\mu(R) = \sum_{r \in R} \frac{1}{r} > \varepsilon, \tag{14}$$

and

$$\text{Min } R \geq 2M. \tag{15}$$

For that ε, we choose a set $A \in \mathscr{A}_p$ satisfying

$$\mu(A) > M_p - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}. \tag{16}$$

where $M_p = \text{Sup}\{\mu(A) : A \in \mathscr{A}_p\} < \infty$ by Theorem 1. Let $A = \{a_1, a_2, \cdots\}$ where $a_1 < a_2 < \cdots$. Since $\sum_{a\in A} \frac{1}{a} < \infty$, there is some n_0 such that

$$\sum_{n=n_{0+1}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a_n} < \frac{\varepsilon}{12}. \tag{17}$$

Let $A_1 = \{a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_{n_0}\}$. Then

$$\mu(A_1) > M_p - \frac{\varepsilon}{6}. \tag{18}$$

by (16) and (17)

Now we take $M = a_{n_0}$ and write, $R = R_1 \sqcup R_2 \sqcup R_3 \sqcup R_4$ where

$$R_j = R \bigcap \{\bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} [(j+1)3^i M, (j+2)3^i M)\}; j = 1, 2, 3, 4. \tag{19}$$

In other words,

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1 &= R \bigcap \{[2M, 3M) \sqcup [6M, 9M) \sqcup [18M, 27M) \sqcup \cdots\}, \\
R_2 &= R \bigcap \{[3M, 4M) \sqcup [9M, 12M) \sqcup [27M, 36M) \sqcup \cdots\}, \\
R_3 &= R \bigcap \{[4M, 5M) \sqcup [12M, 15M) \sqcup [36M, 45M) \sqcup \cdots\}, \\
R_4 &= R \bigcap \{[5M, 6M) \sqcup [15M, 18M) \sqcup [45M, 54M) \sqcup \cdots\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We have,

$$\text{Max } A_1 = M < 2M \leq \text{Min } R, \tag{20}$$

which implies $R \cap A_1 = \phi$, the empty set. Also, it is easy to check that no p elements of $A_1 \sqcup R_j, 1 \leq j \leq 4$, can be in an arithmetic progression. So $A_1 \sqcup R_j \in \mathscr{A}_p$.

Since $\mu(R) > \varepsilon$, we must have

$$\mu(R_j) > \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \tag{21}$$

for some $j, 1 \leq j \leq 4$.

For that j,

$$\mu(A_1 \sqcup R_j) = \mu(A_1) + \mu(R_j) > M_p + \frac{\varepsilon}{12} \tag{22}$$

from (18). This is a contradiction to the fact that M_p is the supremum of the set $\{\mu(A) : A \in \mathscr{A}_p\}$. This proves the lemma.

□

Now we conclude this paper with the proof of theorem 2.

Proof of theorem 2

Proof. Suppose $\{A_n\} \subset \mathscr{A}_p$ be a sequence and $A_n \longrightarrow A$. We need to show that $\mu(A_n) \longrightarrow \mu(A)$.

Let us write the set A as, $A = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, \cdots\}$ where $a_1 < a_2 < a_3 < \cdots$ and similarly for the sets A_n, we write them as, $A_n = \{a_1^{(n)}, a_2^{(n)}, \cdots\}$. Note that if the set A is finite, then $A_n = A$ for large enough n and there is nothing left to prove. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be any given real number. The lemma above allows us to select an N such that for any set $X \in \mathscr{A}_p$ with Min $X \geq N$, we must have

$$\sum_{x \in X} \frac{1}{x} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{23}$$

Let n_0 be an integer such that $a_{n_0} \geq N$. Since $A_n \longrightarrow A$, there is some N_0 such that $a_k^{(n)} = a_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq n_0$ and all $n \geq N_0$. Now, for $n \geq N_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Big|\mu(A_n) - \mu(A)\Big| &= \Big| \sum_{k=n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{{a_k}^{(n)}} - \sum_{k=n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a_k} \Big| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{{a_k}^{(n)}} + \sum_{k=n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a_k} < \varepsilon \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

by (23). Hence $\mu(A_n) \longrightarrow \mu(A)$.

□

References

[1] Joseph L. Gerver, The sum of the reciprocals of a set of integers with no arithmetic progression of k terms, Proceeding of American Mathematical Society, Vol. 62, No. 2, Feb. 1977, pp. 211-214 .

[2] Joseph L. Gerver; L. Thomas Ramsey, Sets of Integers With No Long Arithmetic Progression Generated by the Greedy Algorithm, Mathematics of Computation, Vol. 33, No. 148. (Oct., 1979.), pp.1353-1359.

[3] Ben Green; Terence Tao, arxiv.org/abs/math.NT/0404188

[4] Unpublished lecture, Faculte des Sciences, Paris, Dec. 4, 1975.